

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 192 966

RC 012 259

AUTHOR Garkovich, Lorraine
 TITLE The Population Turnaround in Central Appalachia: A Focus on Eastern Kentucky Coal Counties.
 FUE DATE 19 Aug 80
 NOTE 26p.: Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Rural Sociological Society (Ithaca, NY, August 19-23, 1980).
 EDFS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
 DESCRIPTORS Area Studies; Comparative Analysis; Educational Status Comparison; *Employment Opportunities; *Extended Family; *Migrants; Migration Patterns; *Motivation; Quality of Life; Regional Characteristics; Rural Areas; Rural Population; Sociocultural Patterns; *Socioeconomic Status; *Urban to Rural Migration
 IDENTIFIERS Appalachia (Central); *Kentucky (East)

ABSTRACT

Examining the reversal in out migration since 1970, this study of seven coal-producing, non-metropolitan counties in Eastern Kentucky explored employment related reasons for moving and compared socioeconomic characteristics of residents and migrants. Viewed as typical of major social and economic trends in central Appalachia, Kentucky was chosen for the mail questionnaire survey involving a sample of 2,958 registered voters, whose response rate was 68.9%. Results indicated: (1) strong kinship networks existed in the area; (2) the main reasons for moving to the area were family ties, employment, environment, and retirement; (3) migrants returning because of family ties were younger, less educated, more likely to hold blue-collar jobs, and had lower income; and (4) Kentucky residents were older, less educated, and more likely to hold white-collar jobs than migrants. Conclusions were: (1) kinship ties were seen as a major auspice of migration that may provide a social organization within which migration occurs, even among people who are seeking employment; (2) recent improvements in the coal industry have not been the major stimulus for migration, as quality of life and extended kinship ties were deemed more important reasons for return migration; (3) the "revival of nonmetropolitan America" should be seen as a multifarious phenomenon. (JD)

 * Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
 * from the original document. *

ED192966

The Population Turnaround in Central Appalachia
A Focus on Eastern Kentucky Coal Counties



by

Lorraine Garkovich
Assistant Professor
University of Kentucky

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Lorraine
Garkovich

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper submitted to the Rural Sociological Society 1980 Annual Meetings, Cornell University, Ithaca, New York, August 19-23, 1980. Do not quote without permission.

RC 012259

The Population Turnaround in Central Appalachia

A Focus on Eastern Kentucky Coal Counties

by

Lorraine Garkovich
Assistant Professor
University of Kentucky

ABSTRACT

A 1979 survey of 7 coal-producing counties of Eastern Kentucky provides data on the motivations and characteristics of recent migrants to the Central Appalachian subregion. Analyses shows that 44% of the migrants came to Eastern Kentucky under the auspices of kinship ties while only 27% came under job auspices. Upon controlling for employment status, 38% of the persons in the labor force and 52% of those not in the labor force cite kinship auspices for the move. Migrants under kinship auspices have a lower socioeconomic status than either residents or migrants under other auspices. A discussion of implications for Central Appalachian population change is also presented.

The Population Turnaround in Central Appalachia
A Focus on Eastern Kentucky Coal Counties

by

Lorraine Garkovich
Assistant Professor
University of Kentucky

Introduction

Since 1970, the Central Appalachian region has experienced a net population gain after two decades of population loss. Nearly sixty percent of this population gain is attributable to net migration, and fifty-three percent of this net migration gain has occurred in the Eastern Kentucky counties of Central Appalachia (Pickard, 1978). This population turnaround follows two decades of population loss. From 1950--1970, the Central Appalachian subregion was the only one to register an average rate of population loss. The subregion's population declined through this period from 2.17 to 1.74 million, with a net outmigration of nearly 1 million persons (Ergood and Kuhne, 1976). Yet through the 70's, Central Appalachia had the most rapid population growth of all the subregions, and accounted for twenty percent of the region's population growth.

Simultaneously, coal production in Appalachia, especially the Central Appalachian states of Kentucky and West Virginia, have exhibited significant turnaround. During the late '60's and early '70's coal production in Appalachia increased sixteen percent. Kentucky recorded a sixty-four percent gain in coal production during this period, greater than any other coal producing state in Appalachia. This coal production turnaround follows 15 years of steady decline in coal-related employment in Appalachia (-65% between 1947-1961). Since the mid-60's employment opportunities in the coal fields have increased, and with an employment multiplier of 1.9, direct and indirect employment opportunities have expanded dramatically in the Central Appalachia coal producing states (Niernyk, 1975).

Does the temporal coincidence of these events indicate a causal relationship? Has the boom in coal production and other sectors of the economy provided sufficient

job opportunities to attract new residents to Central Appalachia? Or, is the migration to Central Appalachia part of the national "rural renaissance" fueled by "a new emphasis on quality of life as opposed to more strictly economic considerations (Williams and Sofranko, 1979)? What will be the consequences of this population turnaround for a region with long depleted human resources? These questions will be answered utilizing data from a 1979 survey in seven coal-producing counties of Eastern Kentucky. Specifically, this paper will first, explore the reasons for moving among a group of recent migrants to coal-producing counties to determine the role of coal-related or other employment in the migration turnaround. Second, we will compare and contrast the socioeconomic characteristics of newcomers and oldtimers to assess the potential contributions of newcomers to the human resources of the region.

While the specific focus and data base for this paper is Eastern Kentucky, the results are applicable to the rest of Central Appalachia. All of the Central Appalachian states have experienced similar rates of population change during the '70's and comparable rates of net migration. Eastern Kentucky, like the rest of the subregion, is dominated by small towns and open country living. The conditions in Central Appalachia are the most depressed of the entire region. While the Central Appalachian subregion registered the largest percent increase in income between 1969-1974, this subregion still has the lowest per capita income average compared to the U. S. average (Pickard, 1978) Economic changes in the subregion are closely linked to trends in the coal mining industry, so events in this industry have consequences for other sectors of the economy (Ergood and Kuhne, 1976). Manufacturing in Central Appalachia, traditionally a minor sector of the subregion's economy, has shown strong gains since the early '70's (Ergood and Kuhne, 1976). This has helped diversify economic activities and lessen the subregion's dependency on an erratic coal industry. Events in Eastern Kentucky, then, seem typical of major social and economic trends in the rest of the Central Appalachian subregion. (Table 1).¹

The Decades of Out Migration

To understand the significance of the population turnaround in Eastern Kentucky, and especially the reversal in migration trends, we must first examine those early decades of out migration.

As previously noted, the '50's and '60's witnessed major out migration from the Eastern Kentucky area. During the '50's, the seven county study area posted a net migration loss of 61,291 persons, while through the '60's the loss was 35,504 persons. This out migration contributed to a net population loss over the two decades of 53,144, for an incredible 36.5% population decline.

The few studies of the out migration (Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam, 1963; Schwarzweller, Brown and Mangalam, 1971; Fly and McCoy, 1974) from Eastern Kentucky offer some interesting counterpoints to the dominant economic approach to migration. These studies point to a key role played by extended kinship networks. These networks contributed to "remarkably consistent" patterns of in-and-out-migration during the '40's, '50's and '60's (Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam, 1963; Schwarzweller, Brown and Mangalam, 1971). More detailed analysis of particular streams² of migration reveals, for example, that for the primary (generally short distance) streams, differences in unemployment rates and per capita income between origin and destination were not significantly related to migration rates (Fly and McCoy, 1974). Noneconomic factors, in this case, kinship networks, provided a sociocultural context within which migration to and from Eastern Kentucky proceeded (Schwarzweller, Brown and Mangalam, 1971). This is not to say that the search for employment did not influence the migration process. Rather, it suggests that while depressed economic conditions in Eastern Kentucky did stimulate the decision to move, the choice among destination alternatives was couched within the kinship network.³

Tilly and Brown (1967:142) offer the concept "auspices of migration" to differentiate among the reasons for moving:

By auspices of migration, we mean the social structures which establish relationships between the migrant and the receiving community before he moves. We may say that an individual migrates under the auspices of kinship when his principle connections with the city of destination are through kinsmen even if he comes desperately seeking a job... Of course he may migrate under several auspices at once or none at all.

Although others have not used this terminology, research on rural to urban migration (Litwak, 1960, Jitodai, 1963; Choldin, 1973) and Black migration (Mueller and Ladd, 1970; Shimkin, Louie and Frate, 1976) indicates certain groups - those with lower socioeconomic status or little previous mobility experience--are more likely to migrate under the auspices of kinship than other groups. This terminology permits us to use the migrant's value hierarchy in assessing motivations underlying the move (Mangalam, 1968). This also emphasizes that migration occurs between social systems which provide a social context for the move.

Acknowledging the significance of kinship networks then sheds light on some possible explanations for the counterstream of migration to Eastern Kentucky, an indisputably depressed area, during this same time period.⁴ Schwarzweller, Brown and Mangalam (1971) report that return migrants "to the Beech Creek area commented on such things as: 'laid off'; 'not satisfied with living in Ohio'; or 'to be with kin'; as reasons for returning to the area. Since "the two ends of the Beech Creek migration stream were systematically linked via the kinship structure" (Schwarzweller, Brown, and Mangalam, 1971:118), reverses in economic fortunes outside the mountains were not necessarily devastating. Economic or marital problems could be dealt with "back home," with the help of kin. Persistent patterns of visiting "back home" by out migrants also contributed to the maintenance of ties with Beech Creek neighborhoods.

These earlier studies of migration to and from Eastern Kentucky indicate that while depressed economic conditions in the region led to a massive out migration

of persons, it was not a random movement. Extended kinship networks provided a sociocultural context for the out migration. These kinship networks also enabled the out migrants to retain ties with the "homestead." These ties led to extensive visiting between origin and destination; periodic returns to origin for varying time periods, and a large pool of potential return migrants ready to fuel a counter-stream back to Eastern Kentucky if conditions changed. Such a return could be sparked by improved economic conditions in Central Appalachia, or recession in the metropolitan areas which had absorbed so many out migrants, or a combination of these two, reducing the economic differences between Central Appalachia and the rest of the nation.

The Revival of Nonmetropolitan America

Since 1970, social scientists have been documenting major changes in patterns of population growth and migration. In general, nonmetropolitan areas, whether adjacent to or remote from urban places, are registering a more rapid rate of growth than SMSA's. Out migration from metropolitan areas now exceeds the migration to them; and even the most rural of nonmetropolitan places are experiencing, if not a net in migration, then at least a slowing of out migration. These population changes are affecting all regions of the nation but especially the "Sunbelt" states (Beale, 1975; McCarthy and Morrison, 1978; Fuguitt and Beale, 1978).

Recent studies of the "revival of nonmetropolitan America" have focused on several explanations: (1) Metropolitan sprawl to adjacent nonmetropolitan counties or those within commuting distance; (2) the emergence of nonmetropolitan growth centers, stimulated by the decentralization of manufacturing, service or education industries; (3) development of recreation or retirement communities; (4) a growing residential preference for quality-of-life amenities associated with rural areas, possibly accompanied by a strengthening anti-urban ideology; and (5) a strong surge in extractive industries, especially those in energy production (Beale, 1975;

Carpenter, 1976; Zuiches and Fuguitt, 1976; DeJong, 1977; Blackwood and Carpenter, 1978; Fuguitt and Beale, 1978; McCarthy and Morrison, 1978).

Many of these rely upon an economic explanation for the migration turnaround. Yet, economic interpretations fall prey to the survey research findings which indicate that (1) some migrants to nonmetropolitan areas experience a loss of income as a result of the move; (2) some nonmetropolitan migration streams contain a large number of returnees; and (3) the substantial number of nonmetropolitan migrants citing social ties or quality of life amenities as reasons for moving (Campbell and Johnson, 1976; Campbell et al 1977, Williams and Sofranko, 1979).

An understanding of the reasons underlying the migration turnaround will help illuminate some demographic consequences of the rural renaissance. Campbell et al (1977) report returnees have socioeconomic characteristics between those of rural residents and new migrants. For example, returnees are not as old as rural residents, yet not as young as nonmetropolitan newcomers. Zuiches and Brown (1979) report that, in general, nonmetropolitan areas gain a disproportionate share of older, less educated and lower occupational status migrants. It seems then, that different types of people move to nonmetropolitan areas for different reasons. As a result, the consequence of the rural turnaround in terms of human resources and service demands will depend upon what types of persons are attracted to a particular nonmetropolitan area.

The Eastern Kentucky counties of this study offer an excellent site for examining the causes and some consequences of the rural turnaround. The Eastern Kentucky area is one experiencing economic expansion due to a resurgence of the coal industry and its multiplier effects through other sectors of the economy. Yet it is also an area of strong kinship networks. These networks had provided a familial system within which earlier out migration occurred. Many, if not most of these earlier out migrants retain family ties, and in many cases still own

property in Eastern Kentucky. In the past, these kinship networks provided a "refuge" for migrants needing to "ride out" economic setbacks or personal problems (Schwarzweiler, Brown, and Mangalam, 1971). Today Eastern Kentucky has a revitalized economy, while economic opportunities in the metropolitan areas which had attracted so many mountain migrants are shrinking. Have the changing economic conditions provided an opportunity for earlier out migrants to return home?"

Procedures

Data were gathered in 1979 as part of a Title V socio-economic assessment project (SEAP) of a coal-based economy. A sample of 500 persons from each of seven counties in Eastern Kentucky was drawn from voter registration files. After removing those individuals who were deceased, moved out of state, moved with no forwarding address, or whose mail could not be delivered after 4 mailings, a sample of 2,958 potential respondents was developed. 2,040 returned usable questionnaires for a response rate of 68.9 percent.

Several biases are involved in this sampling procedure. Registered voting lists do not include all the adult population. Yet in Eastern Kentucky, the estimated ratio of eligible persons (18 yrs. +) registered to vote in 1974 ranged from 80--90 percent. A five year time interval is used to determine migrant status, which increases our opportunity to detect recent migrants. No intra-county migrants are included in this sample.

The Dillman and associates (1974) mail survey procedure involving 3 follow-ups, the last being a certified letter, was utilized. Mail surveys risk biases by underrepresenting the young, the mobile, and the poorly educated. Yet, an earlier study comparing the sample characteristics of mail survey respondents with census characteristics revealed only minor variations in age, income, sex, or home ownership traits (Dillman et al, 1974).

Finally, it must be remembered that the sample is exclusively nonmetropolitan. The largest community in the 7 county area is Hazard (1976 pop. 5,968); with the smallest revenue-sharing area is Booneville (1976 pop. 118). It is also a sample drawn from an economically depressed area. 1976 unemployment rates range from a low of 7.1 to a high of 14.6, while the percentage of individuals below poverty level (1975) ranges from 29.2 to 77.6 percent (Kentucky Department of Commerce, 1977). Yet the per capita income in these Eastern Kentucky counties is similar to that of the other Central Appalachian counties (Pickard, 1978).

Migrants: Characteristics and Auspices of Migration

The sample of migrants is nearly evenly divided among males and females. The median age of its migrants is 30.5, while slightly less than 5 percent are 65 years of age or older. One quarter of the migrants report some high school education and another quarter have completed high school. Given the small number over age 65, 17 percent of the migrants report they are retired or disabled. Fifty-five percent of the respondents are in the labor force, while 27 percent are housewives. Among those migrants employed outside the home, the largest occupational groups are: laborers (coal miner or coal related labor and skilled labor or maintenance); professional (technical education or health); operatives (no coal truck drivers or heavy equipment operator); and managers-administrators (self employed or salaried managers of trade establishments). One-half of the migrants report a family income of less than \$10,000, and three-quarters indicate incomes of less than \$20,000 (Table 2).

Reasons for moving to the Eastern Kentucky area fall into 4 main categories;⁵ the single most important one being ties to the area (44%). A quarter of the respondents report moving to the 7 county area to take a job (27%); while the remainder cite environmental (14%); retirement (5.3%) or other (9.5%) reasons. Thus, while the majority of migrants are employed, only one-quarter state their main reason for moving to the area was to take a job. The plurality of migrants citing ties (coming

home, to be near family and friends) to the area as a major auspice of migration suggests the kinship networks which structured out migration from Eastern Kentucky during the '50's and '60's are also functioning to facilitate a return migration.

The role of kinship ties is accentuated if we compare the reasons for moving to the area by employment status.⁶ Among those persons in the labor force, 39 percent state they moved to Eastern Kentucky to take a job, and another 38 percent offer ties to the area as an explanation. In contrast, for those who are not in the labor force, 52 percent report moving because of ties to the area; 17 percent offer environmental reasons and 13 percent report it was to take a job (Table 3). Thus kinship ties are a major auspice of migration for those not in the labor force. It is significant that even among those who are in the labor force, kinship ties represented the major auspice of migration for nearly 4 out of 10 migrants. This situation reflects that noted by Tilly & Brown: kinship ties may provide a social organization within which migration occurs even among persons who are "deperately seeking a job" (Tilly and Brown, 1967).

A socioeconomic analysis of migrants by auspice of migration reveals some interesting differences. Persons migrating under the auspices of kinship are younger (median age 29); less educated; less likely to be employed - or most likely to be in blue collar occupations if they are employed - and to report family incomes of less than \$10,000, than persons migrating under other auspices (Table 4). Thus, as suggested by previous research, different types of persons migrate under different auspices.

A comparison of the socioeconomic characteristics of long-term residents of the Eastern Kentucky area with those of migrants (as a general group) indicates that residents are older, have lower educational attainment, and yet are more likely to hold white collar occupations than migrants. Yet it must also be noted that migrants are more likely than residents to hold jobs in coal production.

However, a comparison of the socioeconomic characteristics of residents with

those of migrants who came to Eastern Kentucky under different auspices reveals some significant differences that are masked when we examine migrants as a general group. Residents are most similar in all traits (except age) to migrants who arrived under kinship or other auspices and least like those migrants who came under job auspices. Variations in the median age of different migrants as compared to residents simply reflect the nearly universal generalization: migrants tend to be younger than nonmigrants. To some degree, these findings support the conclusions of Zuiches and Brown (1979). The Eastern Kentucky area is attracting a disproportionate share of persons with a low socio-economic status. However, this is because of the large number migrating under kinship auspices rather than job auspices. However, these kinship auspice migrants are younger (as a group) than those coming under job auspices, a conclusion at variance with other research findings (Campbell, et al 1977; Zuiches and Brown, 1979).

Discussion

Recent migrants to 7 coal producing counties of Eastern Kentucky have arrived primarily under kinship rather than employment auspices. Four of every 10 cite ties to the area as a main reason for moving to Eastern Kentucky. The number citing ties diminishes only slightly if we examine the reasons for moving among those migrants in the labor force, and increases to a majority among migrants who are not in the labor force.

Additionally, it has been noted that residents of this area are far more likely to be employed in coal related occupations than are migrants. Persons moving under employment auspices predominate in white collar occupations, while those who migrated under kinship auspices are least likely of all the groups (resident or migrants) examined to be in white collar occupations.

These findings suggest several conclusions as to changes occurring in Eastern Kentucky and by extension Central Appalachia. First, it does not appear as if

recent improvements in the coal industry have greatly stimulated migration into the region. Just slightly more than one in 10 of all migrants, and less than 2 in 10 of those in the labor force, cite coal-related jobs as a reason for moving. Indirect economic stimulation (in wholesale and retail trade occupations) and expansion in other economic sectors (education, health, manufacturing, and government services) has had as great a pull for these migrants.

Second, among those moving under other auspices (environmental factors or retirement for example), quality-of-life amenities are slightly more important reasons for moving than the lower cost of living in Eastern Kentucky as opposed to the place of origin. Retirement and disability are important reasons for persons not in the labor force to relocate to Eastern Kentucky.

Third, the large number of migrants, whether in the labor force or not, citing kinship auspices for the move to Eastern Kentucky is higher than that found in most other studies (Long and Hansen, 1979; Williams and Sofranko, 1979). Yet, the findings are consistent with studies of migration to the Ozarks, another region in which the extended or stem family represents a significant social institution (Zimmerman and Frampton, 1935; Campbell et al, 1977). What is remarkable is that after decades of out migration from Eastern Kentucky, after years in an urban environment, the extended kinship ties have retained their strength. Preliminary analysis of data from a restudy of the Beech Creek neighborhoods (now in progress) substantiates the strength of these familial ties. Visiting between the Eastern Kentucky stem and the urban branch families persists, as well as the tendency to return home in periods of unemployment or when parents/grandparents become ill or too old to care for themselves. (Schwarzweiler, Brown, and Mangalam, 1971). It is possible that the coincidence of economic vitality in Central Appalachia and economic stagnation in those metropolitan areas which in earlier decades had served as a gathering place for branch families has simply intensified a pattern of return migration which has always existed. The relatively large number of

migrants, especially those moving under kinship auspices, who are not in the labor force also suggests that even if economic growth in Central Appalachia slows down, the return migration may well continue.

Finally, this research underscores the need to see the "revival of nonmetropolitan America" as a multifarious phenomena. Rural repopulation as a result of manufacturing deconcentration has distinctly different characteristics (in terms of migrant characteristics) and consequences (in terms of community infrastructure) than rural repopulation as a result of the development of recreational/retirement centers or energy-extraction industries (Economic Resource Service 1974; Gruber, 1974; Koebernick and Beegle, 1978; Myers, Hines and Conopusk, 1978). In our haste to develop testable scientific propositions from which we can generalize to this national phenomena, we should not risk losing sight of the great variety in rural revival.

FOOTNOTES

1. Population Change and Net Migration
in 7 Eastern Kentucky Counties: 1950 - 1977

	1950 - 1960		1960 - 1970		1970 - 1977	
	% Change	Net Migration	% Change	Net Migr.	% Change	Net Migr.
Knott	-14.6%	-7,334	-15.3%	-4,976	21.1%	2,000
Lee	-15.1	-2,978	-11.2	-1,502	10.3	400
Leslie	-29.6	-9,453	6.3	-2,048	15.4	600
Letcher	23.8	-16,998	-23.0	-10,451	20.8	3,000
Owsley	-26.7	-3,335	-6.4	-910	11.6	300
Perry	-24.9	-21,857	-26.5	-14,098	13.4	800
Wolfe	-14.2	654	-13.2	-1,519	13.6	500
7 County Area	-22.6	-61,291	17.9	-35,504	+13.7	+7,600

Sources: Ramsey, R. J. and P. D. Warner

Kentucky County Data Book, Resource Development Series 16,
Cooperative Extension Service, University of Kentucky 1974.

Current Population Reports

Estimates of the Population of Kentucky Counties and
Metropolitan Areas: July 1, 1977 (Revised) and 1978
(Provisional)
Series P-26 No. 78-17, 1979.

2. Migration stream may be defined as a pattern of migration which links a particular origin with a particular destination and contains a movement of persons between these two points. Over one-half of all migrants to and from 43 State Economic Areas in Southern Appalachia (which includes what ARC defines as Central Appalachia) moved to and from 30 SMSA's.

3. Studies of Black migration demonstrate a similar note for kinship networks. See for example: Blumberg and Bell, 1959, Shimkin and Shimkin, 1975; Campbell and Johnson 1976.
4. An example of this phenomena is seen in the following analyses presented by Brown, Schwarzweller and Mangalam, 1963 (52):

52

RURAL SOCIOLOGY

Table 2. Percentage of out-migration to and in-migration from state economic areas not contiguous with Kentucky
State Economic Area 2, 1949-50

	Out-migration ^a		In-migration ^b	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total number of migrants to and from noncontiguous areas	(6,130)	100.0	(4,410)	100.0
Kentucky, total	(590)	9.6	(330)	7.5
Kentucky A (Louisville)		3.3		1.9
All other Kentucky		6.3		5.6
Ohio, total	(2,410)	39.3	(1,800)	40.8
Ohio C		10.0		6.8
D		6.4		6.5
K		6.8		9.0
3		5.1		2.8
4		4.5		4.2
All other Ohio		6.3		11.6
Illinois, total	(150)	2.4	(90)	2.0
Indiana, total	(945)	15.4	(510)	12.2
Michigan, total	(305)	5.0	(335)	8.0
All others	(1,690)	27.6	(1,295)	29.4

^a The total number of out-migrants during this period was 10,815, of whom 43.2 percent moved to contiguous areas.

^b The total number of in-migrants during this period was 8,115, of whom 45.6 percent came from contiguous areas.

5. The question on reason for moving was a forced choice response. The question was: What was the most important reason for your move here? Respondents were offered 12 response categories and an open-ended "other" category.

The categories were:

1. To take a coal related job (mining, hauling, reclamation, etc.)
2. To take a job not directly related to coal production
3. Got married
4. Just wanted to come back home
5. Wanted to be near family and friends
6. Cheaper to live here
7. Retired and moved here

7. Retired and moved here
8. Better educational system
9. Lower taxes
10. Property available here
11. Living environment (the type of living conditions I like)
12. Good place to raise children
13. Other (specify)

6. Employment status is determined with a six category variable. The question was: What is your employment situation?

1. Self Employment
2. Employed by other than self
3. Retired or disabled
4. Unemployed
5. Housewife
6. Student

Categories 1, 2 and 4 are classified as "in the labor force" while categories 3, 5 and 6 are those persons "not in the labor force."

Table 1. Population and Income Changes and Coal Production in Central Appalachia

State	Population (1,000)		Total Change (1,000)	Total Change (%)	Net Migration (1,000)	Net Migration Rate	Total Income Change	Per capita Income Index (US=100)	% Change in Coal Production
	1976	1970	1970-1976	1970-1976	1970-1976	1970-1976	1969-1974	1974	1963-1973
Kentucky	980.4	876.5	103.9	+11.1%	+61.5	+ 7.0%	+22.0%	62	+64.2%
Tennessee*	372.4	334.6	37.8	+11.8	+26.0	+ 6.6	+16.8	66	+46.9
Virginia*	224.3	197.3	26.9	+11.3	+17.6	+18.9	+33.0	70	+10.9
West Virginia*	362.4	336.5	25.9	+13.7	+10.5	+ 3.1	+23.9	71	-13.1
Central Region	1,939.4	1,744.9	194.5	+ 3.6	+115.7		+22.5	65.5	(n.a.)

* Figures for those counties in Central Appalachian subregion, those counties in these states located in other Appalachian subregion are excluded from these figures (Pickard, 1978).

Table 2
CHARACTERISTICS OF MIGRANTS
TO EASTERN KENTUCKY (N=303)

<u>CHARACTERISTIC</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Sex		
Male	147	49.1
Female	152	50.9
Age		
19-24	76	25.6
25-34	105	35.3
35-44	43	14.5
45-54	30	10.1
55-64	22	9.8
65+	14	4.7
Median Age 30.5 years		
Educational Attainment		
Less than 8th grade	50	16.6
Some High School	79	26.2
High School Graduate	84	27.9
Some College	50	16.6
College Graduate	22	7.3
Advanced College Graduate	16	5.3
Employment Status		
In the Labor Force	165	45.3
Self-employed	22	7.4
Employed by others	121	40.5
Unemployed	22	7.4
Not in the Labor Force	134	44.8
Retired	51	17.1
Housewife	80	26.8
Student	3	1.0
Occupation of Employed Persons		
Professional, Technical and Kindred	46	17.6
Managers & Administrators	37	14.2
Sales Workers	11	4.2
Clerical and Kindred	22	8.4
Operatives	43	16.5
Laborers	80	30.7
Service	22	8.4
Family Income		
Less than \$5000	82	28.0
5000-9999	65	22.2
10,000-14,999	57	19.5
15,000-19,999	25	8.5
20,000+	64	21.9

Table 3
AUSPICES OF MIGRATION
FOR ALL MIGRANTS
AND BY LABOR FORCE STATUS

	Sample %	In Labor Force %	Not in Labor Force %
Employment Related	27.0	39	13
Coal-production	13.3	18	8
Non-coal related	13.7	21	5
Ties to Areas of Destination	43.9	38	52
Come back home	25.3	22	30
Near Family and Friends	18.6	16	22
Environmental Factors	14.4	13	17
Economic Factors	6.7	6	8
Cheaper to live here	1.8	1	2
Lower taxes here	1.1	1	2
Property Available	3.9	4	4
Amenity Factors	7.7	7	9
Better Educational System	0.7	1	1
Living Environment I like	4.9	4	6
Good Place to RAise Kids	2.1	2	2
Retirement	5.3	1	11
Other reasons	9.5	10	7

Table 4. Characteristics of Residents and Migrants by Auspice of Migration-Eastern Kentucky

	Residents (N= 1737)	All Migrants (N=303)	Auspices of Migration		
			Kinship (N=138)	Job (N=83)	Other (N=59)
Age (median in years)		30.5	29.2	32.0	32.5
<u>Education</u>					
8th grade or less	30%	17%	25% ^Δ	4%	24%
Some high school	23	26	28	20	25
Completed high school	24	28	28	31	22
Some College	11	17	13	18	20
Completed College	7	7	4	14	5
Advanced Degree	4	5	2	12	3
<u>Family Income</u>					
Less than \$5000	29%	28%	32% ^Δ	12%	24%
5000 - 9,999	27	22	28	12	24
10,000-14,999	16	20	19	22	24
15,000-19,999	10	9	9	10	8
20,000-24,999	9	7	4	12	8
25,000-29,999	4	9	6	16	8
30,000 +	6	6	2	15	3
<u>Employment Status</u>					
Employed	49%	48%	36%	72%	41%
Unemployed	6	7	11	5	3
Retired or Disabled	21	17	20	8	17
Not in Labor Force	24	28	34	14	39
<u>Occupation of Employed Persons</u>					
White Collar	45%	34%	37%	56%	48%
Blue Collar	55	66	63	44	52
Coal Related	19	25	--	--	--

Δ Differences among groups based on Chi square significance of .01 level.

REFERENCES

- Beale, Calvin
1975 The Revival of Population Growth in Nonmetropolitan America. Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, USDA, ERS-605, June.
- Brown, James S., Harry K. Schwarzweller, and Joseph J. Mangalam
1963 Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem Family: An American Variation on a Theme by Le Play. Rural Sociology Vol. 28 No. 1, March: 48-69.
- Blackwood, Larry G. and Edwin H. Carpenter
1978 The Importance of Anti-Urbanism in Determining Residential Preferences and Migration Patterns. Rural Sociology, Vol. 43, No. 1, Spring: 31-47.
- Campbell, Rex R. and Daniel M. Johnson
1976 Propositions on Counter Stream Migration. Rural Sociology Vol. 41, No. 2: 127-145.
- Campbell, Rex R., Gary J. Stangler, and George H. Dailey, Jr.
1977 Migration to Nonmetropolitan Areas: The Ozarks. Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society meetings.
- Carpenter, Edwin H.
1976 Residential Preferences and Population Dispersal in Light of Proximity, Economics and Migratory Potential. Paper presented at Rural Sociological Society meetings.
- Choldin, Harvey M.
1973 Kinship Networks in the Migration Process. International Migration Review, Vol VII, Summer: 163-175
- DeJong, Gordon F.
1977 Residential Preferences and Migration. Demography, Vol 14, No. 2: 169-178.
- Dillman, Don A., James A. Christenson, Edwin Carpenter, and Ralph Brooks
1974 Increasing Mail Questionnaire Response: A Four State Comparison. American Sociological Review, Vol 39, October: 744-756.
- Economic Research Service
1974 Migrant Response to Industrialization in Four Rural Areas: 1965-1970. Agricultural Economic Report No. 270, Economics, Statistics, and Cooperative Service, USDA, September.
- Ergood, Bruce and Bruce E. Kuhre (eds)
1976 Appalachia: Social Context Past and Present. Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt Publishing.

- Fuguitt, Glen V. and Calvin L. Beale
1978 Population Trends of Nonmetropolitan Cities and Villages in Subregions of the United States. *Demography*, Vol. 15, No. 4: 605-620.
- Fly, Jerry W. and Clyde B. McCoy
1974 Opportunity Factors and Southern Appalachian Out Migration. Paper presented at Southern Sociological Society meetings.
- Graber, Edith E.
1974 Newcomers and Oldtimers: Growth and Change in a Mountain Town. *Rural Sociology*, Vol 39, Winter: 504-513.
- Jitodai, Ted T.
1963 Migration and Kinship Contacts. *Pacific Sociological Review*, Vol. 6-7, No. 1: 49-55.
- Kentucky Department of Commerce
1977 Deskbook of Economic Indicators.
- Koebernick, Tom and J. Allan Beegle
1978 Migration of the Elderly to Rural Areas: A Case Study in Michigan. in J.A. Beegle and R.L. McNamara (eds). *Patterns of Migration and Population Change in America's Heartland*. North Central Regional Publication, No. 238.
- Litwak, Eugene
1960 Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion. *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 25 No. 4:385-394.
- Long, Larry H. and Kristen A. Hansen
1979 Reasons for Interstate Migration: Jobs, Retirement, Climate and Other Influences. *Economics, Statistics and Cooperative Services Report*, USDA.
- McCarthy, Kevin F. and Peter A. Morrison
1978 The Changing Demographic and Economic Structure of Nonmetropolitan Areas in the 1970s. *Rand Paper Series*, P-6062.
- Mangalam, Joseph J.
1968 *Human Migration*. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press.
- Miernyk, William H.
1975 Coal and the Future of the Appalachian Economy. *Appalachia*, October-November: 29-35.
- Mweller, Eva and William Ladd
1970 Negro-White Differences in Geographic Mobility. in C.V. Willis(ed) *Family Life of Black People*. Columbia, OH: Merrill Publishing.
- Myers, Paul R., Fred K. Hines and Jeff V. Conopask
1978 A Socioeconomic Profile of the Northern Great Plains Coal Region. *Agricultural Economics Report No. 400*. Economics, Statistics and Cooperative Service, USDA, March.

- Pickard, Jerome S.
1978 Appalachian Population and Income Show Significant Growth.
Appalachia. February-March: 41-43.
- Schwarzweiler, Harry K., James S. Brown and Joseph J. Mangalam
1971 Mountain Families in Transition: A Case Study of Appalachian
Migration. University Park, PA: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- Shimkin, Demitri B., Gloria J. Louie and Dennis A. Frate
1976 The Black Extended Family: A Basic Rural Institution and a Mechanism
of Adaptation.
- Tilly, Charles and C. Harold Brown
1967 On Uprooting, Kinship and the Auspices of Migration. International
Journal of Comparative Sociology. Vol 8, September: 139-164.
- Williams, James D. and Andrew J. Sofranko
1979 Motivations for the Immigration Component of Population Turnaround
in Nonmetropolitan Areas. Demography. Vol. 16, No. 2, May:239-255.
- Zimmerman, Carle C. and Merle E. Frampton
1935 Family and Society: A Study of the Sociology of Reconstruction.
New York: Van Nostrand.
- Zuiches, James J. and David L. Brown
1979 The Changing Character of the Nonmetropolitan Population, 1950-1975.
in T.R. Ford (ed) Rural Society in the United States-Current
Trends and Issues. Ames, IA: Iowa State University Press.
- Zuiches, James J. and Glen V. Fuguitt
1976 Mobility Expectations, Preferences and Redistribution. Paper
presented at joint meetings of the American Sociological Association and the Rural Sociological Society.